

9-24-1999

Immigration Policy, Intolerance, and Social Work After World War II

Ariel Racine
Augsburg College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://idun.augsburg.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Racine, Ariel, "Immigration Policy, Intolerance, and Social Work After World War II" (1999). *Theses and Graduate Projects*. 781.
<https://idun.augsburg.edu/etd/781>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Idun. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Graduate Projects by an authorized administrator of Idun. For more information, please contact bloomber@augsb.org.

Immigration Policy, Intolerance, and Social Work after World War II

Ariel Racine

Submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Social Work

Augsburg College
Minneapolis, Minnesota

1999

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK
AUBSBURG COLLEGE
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

This is to certify that the Master's Thesis of:

Deis C. Loois

Has been approved by the Examining Committee for the thesis requirement for the Master of Social Work Degree.

Date of Oral Presentation: September 24, 1999

Thesis Committee:

Glenda Durberry Rooney
Thesis Advisor Dr. Glenda Rooney

Vern M. Bloom
Thesis Reader Vern Bloom

T. Williams
Thesis Reader T. Williams

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation and thanks to my thesis advisor, Glenda Rooney, for offering me her assistance and support throughout this process. She also imparted to me her energy and zest for the field of social work and the work that can be done in it.

I wish to express my thankfulness to my mother who was patient and supportive throughout this process, having gone through it herself. She gave me much encouragement at times that I needed it.

I wish to express my gratefulness to my brothers, Jon and Steve Hillmer, who supported and believed in my capabilities and understood the struggle.

I wish to express my appreciation to my friends who believed in me and saw in me the courage and drive to complete this project. They were also continually patient, supportive, and positive about the researching and writing of this thesis. Lydia Alspach, Charlene Freund, Melissa Blanchard, Nancy Blasiak, Elicia Beckerman, Denise Morrow, Sangita Patel, Sharon Smith, Marge Grahn-Bowman, Sue Betts, Wanda Glover, Tami Peterson, Kim Brodle, my classmates Andrew, John, Lee, and for giving me opportunities to grow and connect: Patrick Marzitelli, and Patrick Froehling.

I wish to thank my readers, Vern Bloom and T. Williams, who taught me much as professors about the field of social work and the history of race relations and social work in the United States. I learned a lot from them, even in the final hour of presenting my thesis.

Thank you.

Abstract

This study is an historical analysis of the profession of social work involvement in immigration policies and social welfare programs. This study sought to explore how the social work profession related to immigration policy from the turn of the century until the present, focusing on the aftermath of World War II. Three themes emerged from the literature: 1) the development of the social work profession; 2) the methods in which social work responded to the events after World War II; and 3) the lack of involvement of society and the social work profession on the behalf of immigrants during this time period. The historical literature documents reviewed indicate that social workers were involved in education, child welfare, health care, and adoption. Few of them are related primarily to immigration. The period studied is 1929 to the present with a particular focus on the aftermath of World War II.

The social work as a profession became more concerned with the condition and circumstances of the immigrants after World War II. At this point, there was more time for reflection and reporting. During the war, social workers had been consumed with industrial matters and maintaining the status quo in a time of chaos. Historical documents suggest that in the years following World War II, the social work profession demonstrated more awareness of the plight of immigrants, especially these immigrant groups that were targeted as alien enemies.

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	4
II.	Methodology.....	5
	Research Question, Data Collection Method, Strengths and Limitations of Method	
III.	Literature Review.....	7
	Overview.....	9
	History: International Disintegration: 1931-1939.....	9
	American Isolation.....	11
	United States Joins the War.....	12
	Pearl Harbor.....	13
	World War II: 1911-1945.....	14
	Initial Defeats & Victory in Europe.....	14
	The Atomic Bomb.....	16
	War Time demands for Labor.....	17
	Racial Crosscurrents.....	17
	Japanese Internment Camps.....	17
	Racial Tensions.....	18
	Postwar International Planning for Peace.....	20
	Immigration Time Periods.....	21
	Immigration Policy: 1900 to Present.....	21
	Immigration Quota: Who is Affected.....	22
	Changes in Immigration Quota Laws & Policy.....	24
	Making Sense of Immigration Policy.....	24
	The Goals of Immigration Policy.....	25
	Colonial Times: 1630-1790.....	26
	Open Door Period.....	27
	Era of Regulation: 1801-1910.....	27
	Years of Restriction: 1910-1980.....	27
	World War II and Influence on Immigration Policy.....	28
	Liberalization of Immigration Policies.....	29
	Current Immigration Laws.....	29
	Social Work and Immigrant Groups.....	34
	Role of Social Welfare Organizations.....	35
	Overview of Social Work as it relates to Immigrant Groups.....	38
	Views of Immigrant Groups by the Social Work Profession.....	39
	Social Work and It's Perspective.....	40
	Social Work, Immigrant Groups, and Internment Camps.....	48
	Further Reporting on the Internment Camps.....	57
	Reporting and Reflection on the Internment Camps.....	60
IV.	Analysis & Results of Historical Study.....	62

V.	Discussion.....	67
VI.	References.....	69

Chapter 1. Introduction

Immigration policy in the United States reflects views of history and society. The role that social work has played in these policies is often remembered as ambiguous. Did social workers play an important role in immigration policy? Or did they turn to other social issues instead? What were social workers views on immigrants and immigration policy? Did these views change over time?

An immigrant is one that immigrates: a person who comes to a country to take up permanent residence. Immigrate is to enter and usually become established; to come into a country of which one is not a native for permanent residence (Merriam-Webster, 1993). The face of immigrants had changed over time and so has the social work profession. How have these two aspects of history related to each other? When did they cross paths and how did they respond to each other? This study will address these questions through literature concerning immigration policy and social work after World War II.

By historically reviewing the literature on immigration policy and social service organizations in the social work profession, this paper will discuss how the social work profession related to immigrants after World War II.

Three themes emerged from this study. First, the findings showed the development of the social work profession. Second, the data discussed the methods in which social work responded to the events after World War II. And third, the findings showed that during the war there was a lack of involvement of society and the social work profession on the behalf of immigrants during this time period. This researcher found various social programs and issues that social workers were involved in, but few of them related primarily to immigration. The period concentrated on is 1929 to the present

with a particular focus on the aftermath of World War II. The purpose of this study is to analyze what the perspective of the social work profession was before, during, and after World War II and how this perspective developed and changed.

Chapter 2. Methodology

Historical analyses can be thought of in time and in space. This research will attempt to make use of both methods as the role of social work and how immigrants were affected by social work and immigration policy is discussed (Leedy, 1993). Beginning with an overview of immigration policy during five periods in the United States, the focus will lead to what social workers were emphasizing during these times. During the last part of the research, the focus will be on the aftermath of World War II and what happened to the Italians, Germans, and Japanese as they were discriminated against during this time. This research will look at the role of social work during the aftermath of World War II.

There are five main periods of immigration law and policy in the U.S. These periods will be examined in light of the role of social work as a profession and the role in policy development and service professions to immigrants. The central questions that guided this exploratory analysis were: 1.) What effects did the social work profession have on immigration policy during the aftermath of World War II? 2.) What role did the social work profession play, if any, during this time period?

Information discussed in this thesis was gathered from books, journals, and statutes. This information is arranged in a chronological time scale that allowed the picture of immigration policy and social work to be viewed in a developmental fashion. This manner of analysis illustrates the progression of immigration during this century and provides depth and content regarding the socio-cultural factors that affected these events. Immigration policy and the social work profession was reviewed and analyzed according to chronological historical analysis. Aspects of immigration policy as it relates to the

social work profession will be reviewed and analyzed as to how changes occurred and where emphasis was given during the time period in question.

Chapter 3. Literature Review

Overview

The literature review is divided into three sections. First, the history of World War II and what preceded this time period is discussed. Second, immigration development and policy is described during this century. Third, the social work profession and what they were involved and concerned with is analyzed according to the time period before, during, and after World War II.

History: International Disintegration, 1931-1939

By 1931, the situation of economic depression had spread worldwide. The Germany economy was virtually bankrupt, the British credit system was tottering, and the foundation beneath every other industrial nation was badly shaken. Economic nationalism thrived, as government after government moved to protect its weakened domestic economy from outside competition. Some powers – notably Japan, Germany, and Italy – also tried to renew their economic strength through military imperialism. Where they conquered, they assimilated, absorbing governments and integrating dependent economies into their own.

A formidable imperialism emerged in Germany. Against a background of economic collapse, the National Socialist party worked its way into the German government early in 1933, established its leader, Adolf Hitler, as dictator, and proceeded to eliminate its opponents. For a time, outsiders refused to take seriously the Nazis' militaristic ideas and racism. But the new government attracted German loyalties and mobilized the country's resources. As the Nazis manifested their power at home, they also asserted it abroad.

America's response was mixed. Franklin Roosevelt entered office eager to sustain the commitments to peace and arms control reached in the twenties, and to expand American's role in world affairs. During his first two years in office, he supported international economic agreements, additional arms limitations, and a continuing role for the League of Nations in keeping the peace.

However, recognizing that national economic recovery had to take precedence over international agreement, Roosevelt felt compelled to make international cooperation a secondary goal.

In 1936 the pace of military imperialism abroad quickened. In May, Italy annexed Ethiopia as a colony. Two months later, civil war in Spain offered Mussolini another chance to extend Italy's influence in the Mediterranean. That same year, the Italian and German dictatorships forged an alliance.

In response to these waves of violence, each threatened nation set its own course. The League of Nations' futile attempt to impose economic sanctions against Italy for attacking Ethiopia merely exposed the League's helplessness. No European power had the energy to confront Japan. Britain and France, though worried about their own imperial interests in Asia, neither condoned nor seriously challenged Japan's conquests. The Soviet Union and France were particularly vehement in condemning Hitler's advances, yet neither trusted the other enough to take an effective joint stand.

American Isolationism

America reacted to the deteriorating conditions abroad by withdrawing more than ever from world affairs. The more violent the world became, the more intensely most Americans felt a rift between their lives and the international struggles.

Most Americans concentrated their feelings of horror on Japan and Germany. The full-scale Japanese invasion of China in 1937 gave Americans their first appalling revelations of what a modern air force could do to an urban population. On the eve of the Second World War Japan's bombing of China's cities produced the same kind of humanitarian outcry in America that talk of bayoneted babies had roused during the First World War. Kristallnacht, a nationwide attack by the Germans in November 1938 on German Jews and their property, horrified Americans. Roosevelt recalled his ambassador from Berlin, but resistance in America to relaxing immigration quotas barred most German Jews from escaping to the United States. Although most Americans would not realize until the mid-1940s how literally the Nazis sought to exterminate the Jews, news about mass arrests and concentration camps increasingly identified Hitler's anti-Semitism as a threat to all civilized values. Japan and Germany, a majority of Americans concluded, were the centers of insane barbarism.

Between 1933 and 1939 Roosevelt moved with the dominant currents of opinion. Although in private he despised Hitler and Mussolini, and wished to block their aggressive moves, he seldom said anything in public on foreign affairs. Convinced that any sustained attempt to reverse the country's isolationist course would deter his ability to ensure the success of the New Deal at home, Roosevelt accepted the neutrality laws without significant opposition. He also congratulated the British and French leaders for their efforts at the Munich Conference to keep the peace. Yet at the same time, Roosevelt made gestures toward stopping the fascist advance.

From 1939 to 1941

While Germany was devouring Europe and threatening Britain with invasion, Americans no longer felt so distant or safe. In the summer and fall of 1940, the number of Americans who believed that the country could close itself off from the war decreased. A majority held onto their desire for peace, but a growing minority believed that the United States should support Britain's resistance. The guideline became "all aid short of war".

As the war raged, the nuances in Roosevelt's thinking grew ever more critical, for in an emergency the president had immense power over foreign policy. Early in his career, Roosevelt came to believe that a great power such as the United States should play an important role in world affairs. His background and training equated Anglo-American culture with civilization, and his instincts told him that Germany was the nation's enemy.

By the summer of 1941, Roosevelt and other administration leaders were convinced that the United States would eventually have to join the fighting. Although the Royal Air Force was winning the battle of Britain, the danger did not diminish. Hitler turned eastward, and the Nazis, with feeble assistance from their Italian ally, conquered the Balkans. Then in June 1941 Hitler launched the fateful thrust of the war, an attack into Russia.

Pearl Harbor

During these crucial months of 1940 and 1941, Asian affairs appeared to be far less important. Most Americans agreed that Japanese imperialism in China and Indochina during the previous decade had posed some kind of threat, but few could

define it. Fewer still in 1940 believed that Japan would dare to fight the United States. Roosevelt largely left the negotiations with Japan to his secretary of state.

By the summer of 1941, the two nations were drifting toward a war neither one wanted. In July, Japan completed its occupation of French Indochina, and Roosevelt retaliated by freezing Japanese assets in the United States. Washington was now in the curious position of battling Japanese imperialism to defend European imperialism in Southeast Asia.

Because American intelligence had broken Japan's secret code, Washington knew that a Japanese attack of some kind was pending. Roosevelt's inner circle guessed that Japan would strike in Southeast Asia. For two reasons, no one seriously considered Hawaii. First, American policymakers to the very end underrated Japan as a second-class power with more bluff than nerve. Second, American intelligence intercepted so many clues leading in so many directions that it made no sense from any of them. At dawn on December seventh, as waves of Japanese planes roared across the naval base at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, and crippled America's Pacific force, no one was ready. A stunned nation officially went to war.

Within days, the attack on Pearl Harbor clarified issues around the word. Congress declared war on Japan after Roosevelt, in a memorable speech, called December seventh "a date that will live in infamy." Britain immediately joined the United States against Japan. The unpredictable Hitler had no obligation to act, but he decided to declare war on the United States, and Italy followed suit. Hence, a surprise attack precipitating an unwanted war became the event that dissolved America's doubts

and propelled it into global conflict. The vast long-range consequences of the plunge – the destruction of isolationism as a controlling policy – would take years to unfold.

World War II: 1941-1945

The Second World War produced lasting changes in American life. In the short run, involvement in the fighting both led to an expansion of the economy that ended the Great Depression, and pushed the United States into a military and political alliance with Britain, China, and Russia that did not outlive the war. But there were also more lasting effects. The war permanently expanded the power of the national government at home, and it raised the country's responsibilities abroad to unprecedented levels. The question for American leaders immediately after 1945 was no longer whether they should broaden the authority of the government, but how they should translate their power.

Between December 1941 and May 1945, the United States, unlike its allies, was continually engaged in two very different wars. In the Pacific theatre of war, where victory depended on control of the seas, the United States fought almost alone. In the European theatre, where victory could be won only on the continent, the United States aided a complex collective effort.

Initial Defeats and Victory in Europe

During the early months of the war, both theatres offered a dismal picture of retreat and jeopardy. Hitler's last thrust came when the first rocket-launched bombs whined across the English Channel. In September the silent and more deadly V-2 rockets, replacing the V-1 "buzz bombs," hit London. They brought terror to England but no success for the Nazis. That same month British and American troops entered Germany. The Russian army pressed through Poland and the Balkans. Except for a

desperate Nazi counterattack at the German-Belgian border – the “battle of the Bulge,” in December 1944 – Germany’s army collapsed inside the Allied vise. By the end of April, Russian troops were fighting in the streets of Berlin. Hitler, ill and deranged, committed suicide in a hidden bunker in Berlin, and on May 7, 1945, German officers formally surrendered to the Allied command.

Russian lives and American productivity had been the basic contributions to victory in Europe. About 20 million Soviet citizens died in the conflict with Germany. In contrast, British losses were about 500,000 and American losses in both theaters of war about 300,000. The United States was the arsenal of the Allied cause. By 1942 America’s war production was equal to the combined output of the Axis powers; by 1944, it doubled the enemy’s total. When Germany could no longer slow the delivery of American goods, the Nazis were doomed to fall beneath the crushing weight of war materiel.

After Germany’s surrender, the chilling facts about the Nazis’ Jewish policy began to be fully disclosed and acknowledged. Systematically, the German government had applied the most effective techniques of modern organization to destroy 6 million European Jews. Although the Roosevelt administration had had substantial knowledge during the war of what was happening, it had refused to make any special effort to rescue the victims of the Holocaust and had even reflected plans to bomb the transportation lines into the death camps. Arguing that rescue through victory was the best policy for saving people from the Holocaust, the Roosevelt administration resisted suggestions for anything that might divert resources from the war effort and delay Nazi defeat. If the

policy seemed wise at the time, in retrospect it has left people with an impression of callous insensitivity to a problem that could not wait.

The Atomic Bomb.

The climactic blow of the Asian war had been in preparation even before Pearl Harbor and had been originally aimed at Germany, not Japan. In 1939 refugee physicists from Europe, fearing the potential of Germany's military technology, began urging the American government to explore the possibility of producing an atomic bomb before the Nazis could develop it. Within a year the project was under way. In top secrecy, groups of scientists at separate laboratories struggle against time to master the secrets of the atom. They learned to control a chain reaction of atomic fission so that it would generate enormous power that they then translated into a technically practical military device. In July 1945 the task was finally completed at a lonely center in Los Alamos, New Mexico, under the direction of physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer.

By then, however, Germany had fallen. A new, inexperienced president, Harry S Truman, sat in the White House. An array of military and civilian advisers counseled the president to use the new weapon against Japan, explaining that it might eliminate the need for an invasion of the Japanese home islands, which was expected to produce heavy American casualties. On August sixth, a single bomb demolished the city of Hiroshima, immediately killing about 80,000 people and maiming and poisoning thousands more. Three days later, just as the Soviet Union declared war on Japan, a second bomb razed Nagasaki. On August 14, Japan surrendered.

War Time Demands for Labor

On the home front, the Second World War ended the depression in the United States. Before the war was over, net farm income almost doubled, and corporate profits after taxes climbed 70 percent. From a total of more than eight million, unemployed in 1940, the curve dropped below a million in 1944. Moreover, an abundance of jobs and an industrial wage scale that rose 24 percent drew into the labor market an additional seven million workers, half of whom were women. There had been no comparable economic boom in American history.

Racial Crosscurrents

While the Roosevelt administration struggled to win the war and ensure postwar peace and prosperity, racial conflict raised basic questions about traditional commitments of Americans to equality and freedom. Assertions that the Second World War was a crusade for democracy stumbled over the fact that white Americans subjected Japanese, Mexican, Native Americans, Black Americans, and other groups to racial prejudice that deprived them of basic human rights.

Japanese Internment Camps

The most shocking example of arbitrary government power occurred on the West Coast immediately after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. A large majority of whites along the West Coast had nursed a traditional hostility toward Asians. After the surprise attack on American territory, they readily believed rumors of a Japanese seditious “fifth column” in the United States that was planning extensive sabotage and communicating with enemy submarines off America’s shores. The government, they cried, must destroy the danger from within. These popular, bipartisan emotions found a willing servant in

Lieutenant General John DeWitt, who headed the army's Western Defense Command. Responding to DeWitt's request, Washington gave the general broad powers in February 1942 to solve the Japanese problem as he chose.

At the outset, DeWitt planned to use stronger measures against the 40,000 alien Japanese (immigrants who by law were denied the right to become American citizens) than against the 70,000 who were American citizens by birth. But that distinction quickly disappeared. Early in 1942 DeWitt ordered all Japanese Americans along the coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California and in southern Arizona to abandon their homes. From temporary stockades, they were transported to ten inland centers where the Army Relocation Authority guarded them for the duration. In *Korematsu v. United States* (1944), the Supreme Court upheld these policies on grounds of national security. Along with their liberty, Japanese Americans lost about \$350 million in property and income.

Concentration camps for 110,000 Japanese Americans were an embarrassment to the Roosevelt administration, which officially described them as relocation centers. After the initial wave of panic passed, government officials discussed ways of reversing their policy and releasing the prisoners. But public opinion was against this policy change. The administration was told that no communities would accept the Japanese Americans. As a compromise the army during 1943 and 1944 issued individual leaves to 35,000 imprisoned Japanese Americans, most of whom served in the United States armed forces. Finally, in January 1945 the prison gates were opened to everyone.

Racial Tensions

Racial tensions between black and white Americans thrown together in northern cities were even sharper. During the depression, when the unemployed crowded the large

cities, 400,000 blacks had left the South and gone north. Then during the early 1940s alone, another million responded to the wartime jobs that beckoned from Los Angeles to Boston. By 1950 approximately one-third of America's black population lived outside the South.

The small economic gains made by blacks under the New Deal had provoked black leaders to press for more. In 1941 A. Philip Randolph, the shrewd president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Partners, introduced a new tactic in the fight for black rights. As the economy was mobilizing for war, Randolph gathered blacks throughout the nation for a mass march on Washington that would publicize America's racial discrimination around the world and possibly disrupt the early stages of war production. Randolph's price for canceling the march was President Roosevelt's intervention in behalf of black workers. Despite his irritation at Randolph's threat, Roosevelt on June 25, 1941, issued a precedent-setting executive order that banned discriminatory hiring "because of race, creed, color, or national origin" both within the national government and throughout its expanding network of war-related contracts. The executive order also established the Fair Employment Practices Committee (FEPC) to oversee these rules.

But it was the need for labor that broadened economic opportunities for blacks during the war. Both in the war industries and in the armed services, Jim Crow rules weakened slightly under the pressure of an increasingly severe manpower shortage. However, racial tensions were mounting, especially over access to housing and public facilities in the swollen industrial areas of the large cities. During the summer of 1943, these emotions exploded from coast to coast in a series of violent racial encounters and riots.

The worst of the riots occurred in Detroit, a primary center of war production, where 500,000 newcomers, including 60,000 blacks, had been squeezed in since 1940. On a hot Sunday in June 1943 a fight between teenage whites and blacks ignited two days of guerrilla warfare and widespread looting. Twenty-five blacks and nine whites were killed, hundreds wounded, and millions of dollars in property lost. By then, some Democrats were openly worrying about “the Negro votes.” Yet every national election between 1936 and 1944 seemed to verify the political wisdom of Democratic policies. If blacks were really discontented, why did they vote as heavily Democratic as any other urban group? Wait until after the depression, the Roosevelt administration had told its black critics. Wait until after the war, it told them in the early 1940s.

Postwar International Planning for Peace

Even as the United States was fighting the war, President Roosevelt had been planning the peace. As in domestic affairs, the president was an inspired spokesman of hope, not only for Americans, but also for yearning peoples throughout the world. Even before Pearl harbor, Roosevelt and Churchill had met to draw up the Atlantic Charter, which proclaimed their ideals for the postwar world. These ideals recalled the Wilsonian principles of political self-determination, free economic exchange, and international cooperation. Roosevelt’s broad goal of the “Four Freedoms” – freedom from want and fear, freedom of speech and religion – became international bywords.

Immigration Time Periods

There are five main periods of immigration policy in the United States. These are the colonial times (1609-1775), the unrestricted, or Open Door, period (1776-1881), the

period of regulation (1882-1916), the years of restricted immigration (1917-1964), and the period of liberalization (after 1965).

Immigration Policy: 1900 to Present

Immigration policy, which is set by the federal government, determines who enters the United States and in what numbers. This is in sharp contrast to immigrant policy, which is largely left to states and localities and governs how immigrants are integrated into the U.S. economy and society. This chapter outlines the principal goals of U.S. immigration policy and the differences between immigration and immigrant policy.

While many of the core elements of our immigration policies were adopted in the colonial era (such as the exclusion of poverty-stricken migrants likely to become public charges), comprehensive, congressionally enacted immigration policies did not emerge until the end of the nineteenth century.

Immigration Quota: Who is Affected

The first broad modern assertion of the federal regulatory power in the immigration area was the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. Chinese immigrants had been imported to work during the labor shortages of the 1840s, but became increasingly reviled during the recession times of the 1870s. In response to popular pressure, the Chinese Exclusion Act suspended immigration of Chinese laborers for ten years, removed the rights of Chinese entrants to be naturalized, and provided for the deportation of Chinese in the United States illegally. It was not until 1943 that the Chinese exclusion laws were repealed.

From 1882 until 1924 national immigration policy focused on excluding persons on qualitative grounds – prohibiting the entry of criminals, prostitutes, the physically and

mentally ill, those likely to become paupers and, beginning in 1917, immigrants who were illiterate. National origin exclusions were expanded to Japanese in 1907 and all Asians in 1917.

The first general, permanent quantitative or numerical restriction on immigration was imposed in 1924, when the National Origins Act was passed. The law placed a ceiling of 150,000 per year on European immigration, completely barred Japanese immigration and provided for the admission of immigrants based on the proportion of national origin groups that were present in the United States according to the census of 1890. Because this census preceded the large-scale immigrations from southern and eastern Europe, this provision represented an explicit effort to ensure that future immigration flows would be largely composed of immigrants from northern and western Europe. The national origins quota system would not be overturned until 1965.

Changes in Immigration Quota Laws and Policy

The election of President John F. Kennedy marked the beginning of a new, more inclusive era in U.S. immigration policy. Kennedy, of Irish descent, had written a book, *A Nation of Immigrants*, denouncing the national origins quota system. With his death, with the power of the civil rights movement growing, and with Lyndon Johnson's landslide election, the Congress enacted the landmark Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965. The law replaced the national origins quota system with a uniform limit of 20,000 immigrants per country for all countries outside the Western Hemisphere. At the same time, the law placed a limit for the first time on immigration from the Western Hemisphere (most notably on Mexico). The law contained within it the seeds of the massive shift away from European immigration that would subsequently occur. It can

also be seen as setting the stage for expanding illegal immigration from the Western Hemisphere into the United States.

The next major milestones in U.S. immigration policy occurred during the period from 1980 to 1990. During this decade three major pieces of immigration legislation were enacted, each representing, for the most part, a major liberalization of national immigration policy.

The decade began with passage of the Refugee Act of 1980. The law was intended to send a clear signal to the world that the nation had adopted an explicit set of policies that committed it to annually receiving a substantial number of refugees. (Previously admissions had been administered in an ad hoc and highly ideological manner.) The law expands the definition of “refugee” beyond those fleeing from communist countries and entitles refugees to certain federally reimbursable social and medical services. Along with the 1965 Act, the Refugee Act’s implementation had had the effect of increasing the representation of non-European countries in the immigration flow.

The Refugee Act was followed by the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) which addresses the issue of illegal immigration. The law introduces penalties for employers who knowingly hire illegal immigrants. At the same time, though, it creates two large programs to grant legal status to illegal immigrants.

The decade culminated with the Immigration Act of 1990, which, among other things, revises legal immigration policy. While the law was purportedly a compromise between exclusionary and inclusive forces, in fact, it represents a major liberalization of

legal immigration policy, as total admissions were increased by 40 percent. Much of the increase, though, is allocated to highly skilled immigrants (Fix and Passel 1991).

While the contending forces in U.S. immigration policy do not seem to have changed their postures significantly over time, this brief discussion suggests that the pace of immigration policy reform has accelerated. Before 1980, major reform of immigration policy took place every quarter century. Now, less than four years after enactment of the 1990 Immigration Act, immigration policy and its reform are again a central focus of congressional attention.

Making Sense of Immigration Policy

Making policy sense of the widely varying types of action represented in this chronological sketch requires clear separation of three distinct parts of U.S. immigration policy: (1) legal immigration, (2) humanitarian admissions, and (3) illegal immigration. Failure to keep these domains separate may be the most important source of confusion in the current national debate.

The distinction is crucial because the three domains are governed by different legislation, administered by different bureaucracies, and involve different administrative functions – functions that range from paramilitary operations to apprehend illegal immigrants, to language training to facilitate immigrant integration. The various parts of immigration policy are also motivated by different goals.

The Goals of Immigration Policy

The principal goals of U.S. immigration policy in 1980 to the present are:

- Social – unifying U.S. citizens and legal residents with their families;
- Economic – increasing U.S. productivity and standard of living;

- Cultural – encouraging diversity;
- Moral – promoting human rights;
- National and economic security – controlling illegal immigration.

The current debate tends to focus on the economic outcomes and neglect the social, cultural, and moral goals. Thus, many critiques of immigration policies ignore the intent of their framers (Fix and Passel, 1994).

Colonial Times: 1630-1790

During the colonial period, immigration policies of Britain and local governments shared two goals. They attempted to populate the colonies and to provide a significant source of labor for agriculture and skilled occupations. During this time, there was advertising abroad, offers of land grants, and promises of religious tolerance. There were shipments of convicts and an active policy of indentured servants. Under these circumstances, poor people were obligated to serve from four to seven years in return for passage, housing, and a share of produce. At the end of indenture, these servants became free and could hold title to land. Besides adult settlers, records show that there were boatloads of children of poor people taken from cities in Europe.

The total number of immigrants, from settlement to statehood (1630-1790) was estimated to be below one million. This was less than in previous years. Almost all white immigrants were from northwestern Europe, mostly from the British Isles (78.9 percent). Therefore, as far back as the colonial times, the ethnic color was set. The earliest colonists set the stage for a national Anglo-Saxon image.

Open Door Period: 1790-1800

The second period of immigration is the Open Door Period. In the first 100 years, the United States encouraged free entry of settlers from other countries for the reason of populating the continent and increasing the labor force. In 1790, Congress passed the first federal laws on naturalization of aliens. These laws stated that any free white person who resided for two years in the United States or under its jurisdiction could become a citizen. The Alien Act of 1798 only lasted two years and was designed to harass political opponents of the party in power. Other than this there were no other serious legal obstacles to immigration.

The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service first took a count of immigrants in 1820. During the time between 1820 and 1880, ten million people immigrated to the United States. Ninety-five percent of these immigrants were from northern and western Europe. By 1860, approximately 9.5 million Africans were brought to the Americas and over sixty percent were brought to the United States (Minahan, 1998). Although Congress prohibited the slave trade in 1808, it did not actually end until the Civil War.

Even though there was an open legislative door for immigrants, domestic forces of nativism and restrictionist policy were increasing. Nativism is a strong opposition to an internal group under the belief that it has foreign connections. Nativist feelings were in response to the large increase of Irish and German immigrants. Their arrival occurred simultaneously with critical economic and political conditions in Europe. Nativism was usually expressed in an anti-Catholic context.

Era of Regulation: 1801-1910

During the Era of Regulation, the earlier attempts at regulation took shape in one of three forms. These forms were establishment of federal control, emphasis on “undesirable” categories, and exclusionary legislation on racial grounds. Many types of criteria that provided grounds for exclusion were developed and enforced. Certain problems, such as a series of personal, political, and moral issues, could result in a refusal of entry. This finally led to the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 (ch. 126, 22 Stat. 58).

Despite the growing racist and negative attitude toward newcomers, immigration thrived. In the three decades from 1881 until 1910, about 17.7 million people entered the United States. In 1907, the peak year, 1,285,349 people were admitted to the United States (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service [U.S. INS], 1983). At this time however, there was a change in national origins. The “old” immigration from northwestern Europe gave way to the “new” immigration from southern and eastern Europe. The restrictionist movement developed racist theories that assumed these immigrants were inferior. In 1911, a Joint Commission on Immigration, led by Senator William P. Dillingham, issued a report that gave support to this position. This movement occurred in conjunction with organized labor’s concern that immigrant workers would take away jobs and lower wages.

Years of Restriction: 1910-1980

The fourth period was called the Years of Restriction. This time is remembered for the Immigration Act of 1917 (ch. 29, 39 Stat. 874) and the establishment of a literacy test for immigrants who were over 16 years of age. More restrictions were put on laborers from Asian countries, including India, Indochina, and Afghanistan. One of the

main features of this period was the beginning of national quotas, first in 1921 and then more sophisticated with the Immigration Act of 1924. The Immigration Act of 1924 (ch. 190, 43 St. 153) reduced the annual national quota of immigrants to 165,000 and set quotas at two percent of the foreign born of the nationality recorded in the 1890 census. This was later revised to relate to the 1920 census.

The system favored the northern and western Europeans, who made up about 82 percent of the total quota. People who were ineligible for citizenship, such as nonwhites, particularly the Chinese, were not allowed to enter at all. The requirement that visas needed to be obtained in their home country allowed U.S. consular officials abroad extensive authority to screen applicants on many types of criteria. More than this, the new legislation did not distinguish between refugees and immigrants. Therefore, annual quotas limited the entry of those fleeing Nazi extermination.

World War II and Influence on Immigration Policy

World War II and what transpired afterward forced certain changes in immigration policy. The Chinese Exclusion Act was repealed in 1943, and a token quota of 105 was set up for Chinese immigrants. The War Brides Acts of 1954 and 1947 (ch. 591, 59 Stat. 659; ch. 289, 61 Stat. 401) permitted admission outside the quotas for about 120,000 wives and children of American servicemen.

The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (ch. 647, 62 Stat. 1009) allowed about 220,000 people admission, but the legislation was quite restrictive. Sponsors were required to guarantee support and applicants were not granted non-quota status. The act was liberalized in 1950, and in 1953, 205,000 people were allowed non-quota status. The principle of distinguishing between immigrants and refugees was established.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (McCarran-Walter Act: ch. 477, 66 Stat. 163) codified previous legislation and tightened national quotas. By setting separate quotas for colonies, black immigrants from the British West Indies were removed from the substantial British quota. Token quotas were given to Asians, and their exclusion from eligibility for naturalization ended. This act was the last major legislation of the restrictive era since global politics were changing the direction of American foreign policy.

Liberalization of Immigration Policies

The fifth period is entitled Liberalization. The relationship among immigration policy, domestic policy, and foreign policy is illustrated in the Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965 (P.L. 89-236) and later modifications. This was the legislative base of current United States policy. In response to a more pluralistic society and redistribution of power among other nations, the 1965 immigration legislation got rid of national quotas and stopped discriminatory Asian restrictions. An overall ceiling of 190,000 visas was determined with only 120,000 reserved for the Eastern hemisphere. However, these were limited to 20,000 per country and were to be distributed mainly to designated family members and people with specific skills.

Current Immigration Laws

Concerning current law, numerical limits, and preferences, legislation in effect in 1985 permitted three major streams of entry for permanent residence in the United States. The first category, which was exempt from numerical restriction, was made up of immediate relatives of United States citizens, such as spouses, unmarried minor children, and parents of adult citizens. Also specific categories of immigrants were exempt:

particular ministers of religion, particular former employees of the United States government abroad, and particular former United States citizens.

The second category included immigrants who entered under the allowed overall quota of 270,000. Every foreign country was limited to an annual ceiling of 20,000 visas. Dependent areas and colonies were limited to 600 visas. There were six preference classifications for entry visas in this category, four based on family ties and two on occupation.

The third category was made up of refugees, whose numbers were determined annually by the president after consultation with Congress. This flexibility was built into the legislation. The refugee program was designed not to establish a stable population policy but to respond to special needs. After being in the United States for one year, refugees could acquire legal permanent resident status. A special category, “entrants,” was established to meet the emergency situation faced by the arrival, directly from their homelands, of large numbers of Cubans and Haitians who were not accorded refugee status. Another category, “asylees,” was created to protect aliens in the United States or at a port of entry who faced persecution if they returned to their home country. Asylees were allowed to apply for permanent status after one year, but not more than 5,000 per year could have their status adjusted.

To understand the size of the new population, it is important to note that refugees, entrants, and asylees were outside established immigrant quota, as were immediate relatives who did not come in under numerical restrictions.

Policy makers were concerned about the impact of undocumented workers on the economy. Most studies conclude that the undocumented immigrants take jobs that North

Americans do not want and therefore are not in direct competition with native workers. In periods of unemployment and underemployment, however, the undocumented may reduce job opportunities and depress wages for the unskilled domestic worker. However, these are only hypotheses.

A second concern with undocumented aliens is the extent to which they drain social service resources. It is not often recognized that those who are regularly employed have social security and income tax deductions. Small sample studies have shown that illegal aliens generally make below-average use of income transfer programs, in part because they are a young working population and in part because they fear exposure and are therefore reluctant to use their entitlements. They also use the educational system less than their numbers would indicate, although their children do have entitlements to attend. They tend to use public hospitals for health care, and if not covered by an insurance program, the cost must be carried by the local community. Generally, refugees have above average, immigrants have average, and undocumented aliens below-average use of social service benefits and entitlements.

Concerning the debate on immigration, there is general concern about more effective controls of borders and for regularizing the situation of long-term undocumented alien residents. Questions remain about the effectiveness of sanctions and the inability to determine adequately either the number of undocumented aliens in the United States or their impact on the job market. It is debatable whether the population movement from Latin America, given its proximity and extensive land border can be effectively controlled by a single legislative act.

In general, thought on immigration tends to distinguish between the old and the new immigrants. The “old” immigrants are primarily English, Irish, and German, who came in the first half of the nineteenth century, and the “new” are immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, including Italians and Russians, who came at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries.

In addition to geographical changes in immigration, there were other demographic changes. The immigrant group is young, which is usual for newcomers. What is unusual is that there tends to be a small majority of women, reflecting both an emphasis on family reunion and the opening of job markets to women workers. There are fewer newcomers with skills and advanced professional training, which may reflect the increasing immigration from developing countries.

After on hundred years of almost total exclusion, Asians are now the fastest-growing minority in the United States. By 1981, over 40 percent of refugees and immigrants were Asian compared with six percent in 1965. More than that, data indicate that emigration stems mainly from populous areas. Projections estimate that by 2050, Asians will be as large a minority as Hispanics in the United States.

Even though there is a geographic area that is known as the Asia-Pacific triangle, Asians actually emigrate from at least a dozen different countries, speak different languages, and have different cultural and political backgrounds. In addition, they come from a range of economic classes and fall into categories anywhere from self-supporting immigrants to dependent refugees.

There are changes in the numbers of Asian people in the United States. The Japanese predominated from 1910 until 1970. By 1980, the Chinese were the most in

number. In 1990, the Filipinos outnumbered the Chinese. The Koreans have become the third largest group. Growing in numbers are immigrants from the Indian subcontinent, many of whom are seeking entry into business, industry, and the professions. Increasing Asian immigrants are the Indochinese refugees, originally from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

Although adaptation needs differ according to social class, educational level, and prior existence of the specific immigrant group, all Asians except the Indians have difficult language problems, and all without exception experience social and cultural distance from their new communities.

The situation of Hispanics deserves attention, because of the large numbers involved, the relationship to earlier resident groups, and the historical background of the Hispanic population in the United States. Large numbers of Hispanics became citizens as a result of territorial acquisition in Mexican and wartime gains, such as in Puerto Rico. Therefore, large numbers of Hispanics did not immigrate to the United States but were incorporated into it. Subsequent immigrants, both legal and illegal, could identify with these resident Hispanics, who had maintained their language and culture. A second distinguishing feature is the proximity of the Latin countries. These particular Hispanic immigrants, who were able to walk across a border, became known as "feet" people. Whereas Mexican newcomers are heavily concentrated in California and the Southwest, those entering from the Caribbean tend to settle in Florida and the northeastern states. In 1980, it was estimated that the non-Puerto Rican Hispanic population in New York City alone ranged from 900,000 to one million with Dominicans, Cubans, and Colombians,

representing the dominant groups. These numbers include immigrants, refugee entrants, and undocumented aliens.

Social Work and Immigrant Groups

Immigration problems occur for immigrants, national policy, and for the role of social work. Immigrants share the social problems of native citizens, which are increased by their experiences of dislocation, readjustment, and adaptation. In addition, refugees often suffer from wartime deprivation, persecution, and time in camps. Undocumented aliens face additional apprehension, pressures, and uncertainty about the future. All of these groups struggle with cultural differences that may invalidate Western concepts of health and mental health and therefore frustrate the treatment methods themselves.

National Policies

National social policy issues in relation to immigrants may be roughly grouped in four categories: issues of nationhood and civic unity, labor market issues, welfare issues, and humanitarian and civil liberties concerns.

The labor market issue argues that new immigrants, in particular the undocumented, are likely to take jobs from unemployed Americans. However, evidence on this is not conclusive. Many newcomers work at jobs that are not considered desirable by native workers, and many work in ethnic enterprises such as restaurants. On the other hand, the resurgence in the garment industry of sweatshops using immigrant labor supports the labor market argument: the availability of a new cheap labor supply can depress wages and lower standards for the minority worker. Unions have taken it upon themselves to bring the newcomers up to approved standards, which appears to be a recurring pattern for immigrant groups.

Another policy question concerns the issue of the welfare dependency of newcomers. In reality, new immigrants are not a burden on the welfare system. The selection process leads to a motivated, younger, family-related, self-supporting group. The welfare dependency of refugees is higher for certain populations, particularly those from rural areas without education or skills. Since refugee policy is linked to foreign policy aftermath, self-support training for these groups remains a cost of national overseas involvement.

Finally, civil liberties and humanitarian issues arose in relation to immigration policy. The uneven treatment of newcomers based on country of origin, race, and political ideology is an issue that has been raised, for example, with regard to Cuban and Haitian entrants.

Role of Social Welfare Organizations

Social welfare organizations have played a role in aspects of immigration in the United States. Historically, immigrants depended for help mainly on earlier arrivals from their own group, self-help ethnic associations, sectarian charities, and a few specialized nonsectarian social agencies. With the large stream of refugees before and after World War II, work with newcomers increased. More recently, specialized agencies have been concerned with the international adoption of children. However, despite these efforts, immigrants and their needs have not become integrated into the mainstream of social work training and practice nor the service provisions of social welfare organizations. The services tend to be auxiliary.

The development of large-scale refugee programs under the Refugee Act of 1980 activated a new system that gave the public sector a stronger role in service delivery. The

U.S. Department of State has initial responsibility for negotiating refugee contracts on a case-by-case basis with the voluntary resettlement agencies (VOLAGS). VOLAGS then assume responsibility for 90 days. The VOLAGS include the American Council for Nationalities Services, the Church World Service, the Hebrew Immigration Aid Society (HIAS), and the International Rescue Committee. They also include the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, the United Catholic Conference, the World Relief Refugee Service, the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief, the Tolstoy Foundation, and one agency for Czech and one for Polish refugees. Following this preliminary effort, responsibility at the federal level then shifts to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Through its regional offices, this department works on a series of activities in relation to refugees in various states. These activities include arranging a program for assistance and contracting with both public and voluntary agencies, including mutual assistance associations (MA), in order to serve a provider in relation to certain social services. Although targeted to refugees, this delivery option has also supported many ethnic groups that provide services directly to their own members, thereby establishing a model for ethnic organization.

A number of ethnic associations now exist for immigrants as well as for refugees, and those that are able to offer services may effect the establishment of a new delivery system with a capacity to recognize ethnic needs and relate to cultural differences. Whether these new groups will be integrated into the established social welfare system and whether they will retain their particular identity are questions for the future. Current works suggest that the effort to bring social work services to new immigrants can move simultaneously in two directions. These are encouragement for social work in all sectors

to develop an ethnic-sensitive practice, and recognition of the validity of the ethnic association and the ethnic agency as appropriate parts of the service delivery system.

The Alien Registration Act of June 28, 1940, required the registration and fingerprinting of all aliens resident in the country and added to the classes of aliens subject to deportation. This first registration took place in the fall of 1940 by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice through the post offices. Social workers stated at this time, in a rather paternalistic voice, that aliens generally complied “wholeheartedly” with the congressional requirement, accepting the obligation with “good will”. They also stated that earlier fears of some that such a procedure might lead to abuses and “witch hunting” proved unjustified.

Immediately following the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor on December 8, 1941, President Roosevelt issued proclamations identifying natives and citizens of Germany including Austria, Italy, and Japan residents in the United States and its territories who had not acquired American citizenship as alien enemies. These proclamations made these alien enemies subject to summary arrest on suspicion of subversive conduct and to internment for the duration of the war, and actually deprived them of access to the civil courts concerning internment. Regulations were prescribed regarding their conduct. They were required to leave at police stations all firearms, cameras, short-wave radio sets, and other designated articles. Air travel was prohibited and travel beyond the borders of the community of residence required the permission of the local United States Attorney, whose consent was also necessary for changes of residence and employment. The proclamations also directed the Secretary of War to prescribe military or restricted areas from which alien enemies were to be excluded at the direction of the military.

Alien enemies who were under suspicion were arrested by the F.B.I. on Presidential warrants and placed in the custody of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. In deference to the democratic process of trial by jury, the Attorney General established civilian hearing boards before which those who were arrested were able to present explanations of their conduct or evidence of their loyalty. These boards were authorized to recommend to the Attorney General, as the final arbiter, internment, parole, or dismissal. Following receipt of orders for internment, alien enemies were placed in the custody of the Army for the rest of the war. By September 30, 1942, only 11,372 alien enemies had been taken into custody, a relatively small number considering the total of alien enemies in the country. Social workers reported during this time that this was an "indication of the loyalty of the great majority of the alien population to the United States" (Kurtz, 1943).

Overview of Social Work as it relates to Immigrant Groups

This section discusses the various aspects of social work in its relationship to immigrant groups before, during, and after the period of World War II. This section discusses how social work viewed the immigrant groups and concerns of the immigrants. Also, the priorities of the social work profession are depicted throughout the different years.

View of Immigrant Groups by the Social Work Profession

The United States is the country of greatest immigration. All people in the United States, with the exception of the Native American Indians are immigrants or the descendants of immigrants. In 1930, the census gave the number of foreign born in the

United States at 14,204,149. With their American-born children, approximately 26,000,000, they constituted one-third of the total population.

Regarding social services to immigrants, the emphasis in social services to immigrants was originally on protection from exploitation at the time that they arrived and were inducted into first employment. The immigrant who was unable to speak English and unfamiliar with the laws, customs, and institutions of the United States was and often still is easy prey for unscrupulous members of his or her own race who preceded him and were ready to profit by his bewilderment on arrival. As early as 1794, an Emigration Society was established in Philadelphia for the information and assistance of persons coming from foreign countries. The New York Legal Aid Society was originally an organization devoted to protect German immigrants. The Immigrants Protective League of Chicago was another social service agency that specialized in services to the foreign born.

Regarding legal procedures, the procedures of admission, exclusion, deportation, repatriation, registration, and naturalization have been focus points for exploitation and protection. These are the legal steps associated with the process of assimilation to the native born. Following the pattern of family migration, the husband and father migrants first, secures employment, establishes a home, and then sends for his family. In this process of reunion, the immigrant and his family are beset by legal and procedural difficulties that have increased as immigration laws have become more restrictive and attitudes toward aliens less hospitable.

Regarding legal aspects and policy of immigration, the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States were enacted in piecemeal fashion over a period

of sixty years, beginning with 1888. In each period of hysteria and heightened tension, demagogues stampeded Congress into pushing through laws that would “save the country from the menace of the aliens.” Such legislation was enacted following the assassination of President McKinley, at the time of the First World War in 1917, and preceding the Second World War in 1940. Each new law was comprehensive and contained sections whose provisions conflicted with earlier laws. In 1947, the United States Senate adopted a resolution authorizing the Senate Judiciary Committee to investigate immigration and naturalization and to codify all the laws on the statute books. The Senate Judiciary Committee held public hearings and “studied” the matter for three years. The result of this Senate investigation is the Walter-McCarran Law. This Law was supposed to codify all existing immigration and naturalization laws and narrow them down into one easily understood law. However, the Walter-McCarran Law, in itself, is as confusing as all immigration and naturalization laws previously enacted. It is poorly written and some sections of the Law completely contradict other sections (Green, 1953).

Immigration policy refers to the laws and practices that accomplish two related but distinct goals. First, to allow persons to reside in the United States permanently (including refugees admitted for resettlement), with the right to petition voluntarily to become citizens. Second, to permit persons to enter the United States and stay for various but limited lengths of time, without the right to petition for citizenship. The first goal refers to immigrants as usually defines: people who come to settle, live, and work in a new homeland and usually, but not necessarily, to become citizens in due course. The second objective refers to a variety of people who enter with some temporary status. This includes tourists, students, people on business trips, and temporary workers of all kinds

including agricultural laborers, athletes, entertainers, managers in multinational corporations, media representatives, diplomats, exchange visitors working in research centers and government laboratories, and scientists in medicine, industry and universities. The distinction between permanent immigrants and aliens on temporary status, for example workers or visitors, is not always clear. This is due to the fact that as many as one third of those admitted as immigrants return eventually to their homelands (Warren and Peck, 1980) and given that many visitors overstay the authorized duration of their visas, some never return to their countries of origin.

U.S. immigration policy has four broad objectives. The first is to reunite families of citizens and legal permanent resident. The second is to admit needed workers, some as permanent residents and some for temporary stays. The third is to resettle those of the world's refugees who are of special interest to the United States for humanitarian reasons because of their suffering and desperation of their situation. And the fourth is to accommodate the temporary stays of a variety of people, from tourists to diplomats, whose movement across borders is part of the political, economic, and social practice of most contemporary societies. These four objectives are achieved by granting visas to foreign nationals for permanent residence or temporary stays.

Social Work and it's Perspective

Immigrants of the United States have been greatly affected by the economic depression in ways that are beyond the discomfort normally experienced by natives. The goals and activities of agencies working especially for immigrants remain predominantly the same regardless of the social and economic changes taking pace during this year;

however, there are trends and new problems that have developed in the three previous years (Hall, 1933).

The field of social work concerning immigrants is involved with the social consequences of migration. Social work activities deal with the experiences of individuals, families, and groups at points of crisis in the process of migration. Social work also deals with the newer situations in which individuals, families, and groups at points of crisis in the process of migration. Social work also deals with the newer situations in which individuals and families are compelled to emigrate back to the countries that they came from. Social work deals with inherent problems to the successive phases of social adjustment which follow migration. There are five goals of social work in 1933: (1) to decrease the hardships, actual and mental, due to migration, (2) to give similar aid to those preparing to depart from the United States and facing readjustment to life in the original country, (3) to restore social grounding and to re-establish the social status for individuals in the United States which approaches the level upon which they lived in their original country; (4) to act as a buffer between the immigrant and recurrent anti-foreign attitudes and propaganda, to answer unjust attacks, and to bring forward facts to counteract hostile interpretations and misrepresentations, and (5) to speed up the processes of constructive social integration between groups of immigrants and groups of socially dominant people (Hall, 1933).

The field of social work also includes efforts for social reform in four areas: (1) in public education, to remove discriminatory attitudes toward foreigners in general, and toward particular nationalities and races, (2) in the provision of public facilities, municipal and state, to equalize for immigrants the opportunities for education,

occupation, and when necessary for relief and protection against exploitation, (3) in state legislation, for the purpose of protecting the civil rights of aliens, and (4) in modification of the national immigration policies of the federal government in order to reconcile the regulations and the execution of immigration, deportation, and naturalization laws (Hall, 1933).

Although social work in the area of immigration has been difficult in some instances by recent popular attitude, its programs have maintained a consistent course of dealing with episodes in the experience of immigrants. These problems in social work are caused by the important differences in the old and new surroundings in every area of life of the immigrant. Social work in immigration also deals with certain legal problems that are a result of the political status of immigration. Social work attempts to promote social integration by facilitating natural social exchange on a basis of art and cultural interests and civic projects between immigrants and natives. Problems in these areas are exacerbated when blocks in communication arise between adult immigrant and adult native sectors of the general community and between the client and the social worker due to ignorance of each other's language. Consequently, there is a responsibility for making sure that English is taught by means suitable to adults, either through private or public effort as a part of the field of social work (Hall, 1933).

During 1930, the United States Census shows that the size of foreign-born populations with their children has changed slightly in the past 10 years, and that the character remains predominantly the same. Over 36 different language groups are reported. The number of the foreign-born is 14,204,149 and the American-born children of foreign or mixed parentage is 26,082,129. These figures have little meaning until put

together. The total of the two groups, 40,286,278, represents about one-third of the population of the country (Hall, 1933).

Re-immigration within the country has distributed the immigrant population into rural areas as well as into cities. New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Michigan, California, Ohio, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Connecticut, and Washington are the 12 states having the highest percentage of immigrant families in the order listed. The states receiving the largest number of new immigrants, however, were New York, California, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Michigan (Hall, 1933).

Certain nationalities at any given time present a more urgent need for social care and concern than do others. The intensity of social need varies extensively with the stages of social need varies extensively with dominant groups through which all immigrations pass. The degree of need depends on such factors as: (1) breadth of contrast between original environment and the environment found in the United States such as takes place with rural people who have migrated to industrial cities. Climates are often as important as are the divergences in social, health, and religious concepts and in inherited customs, (2) time of arrival, (a) of the larger group, (b) of the family to join that group, or (c) of the individual to join the family, (3) occupational opportunity, or the worst of it, an acute problem for all in 1932, but especially so for the immigrant, (4) degree of social sophistication of the individuals, (5) age of individuals when emigration takes place, (6) personality traits, stability, and strength of character, (7) classification as to status under the immigration law, (8) language facility. Language facility does not in itself constitute a problem, but it makes every other problem more acute by acting as a block to communication and by preventing intelligent conversation of that problem. (9)

Degree of separation of the members in a family, or between a family and its relatives, caused by the fact of migration and by the inflexibility of movement allowed between countries (Hall, 1933).

Immigrants and their children may have the same social needs as other people and also have special problems due to their immigrant status. The average immigrant comes to the United States with few resources, unable to speak English, and unfamiliar with American customs and institutions. Consequently, the immigrant usually settles in the poorest sections of urban communities and finds work in industries where conditions are the worst, wages are low, and hours long. The immigrant is easily exploited. The immigrant's poverty and difference were often met with suspicion and hostility on the part of older groups in the population. To obtain a sense of status and security, immigrants turned to their own community. The following rejection by the immigrant children of their natural backgrounds and the breakdown of parental authority produces personal and social maladjustment. Social agencies dealing with immigrants and their children are confronted with these problems. The social agencies include social, civic, and educational organizations specializing in immigration work, social agencies such as settlements, religious societies, public schools, libraries, and other government institutions, adult education agencies, and liberal organizations, which endeavor to protect the rights of immigrants (Hall, 1935).

40,000,000 people, close to one-third of the country's population, are immigrants of their children. Despite this figure, public interest in the problems of the immigrant has decreased since the present quota law went into effect in 1924. Restriction, adopted as the national policy after World War I, did not solve the immigration problem. The doors

were not closed until 38,000,000 immigrants had been admitted and until the foreign born had increased to 14,204,149, the largest number in the United States' history and their children to 26,082,129 (Census of 1930). As a result of a century of mass immigration, the majority of communities in the United States face an ethnic or interracial problem. In its larger aspects the problem is four-fold (Hall, 1935). The adjustment of the immigrant to his new environment and the protection, education, and assimilation of the immigrant. Helping the children of immigrant parents to be familiar with and proud of their inheritance and acquainting their parents with the customs and attitudes among which their children are growing up. The attitude of the older American community toward the immigrant and the immigrant's children, the problem of intolerance and discrimination on one side and of mutual understanding between the different elements in the population on the other. Cultural inheritance, the problem of preserving and incorporating as a part of the American inheritance the part of the immigrant's traditions and culture as will enrich a common life (Hall, 1935).

Social agencies specializing in immigration have attempted to make some contribution. There is a very different philosophy in social work with immigration compared to that of many Americanization efforts that proliferated during and following the World War. Those efforts concentrate on teaching the immigrant English, civics and increasing the naturalization process. Often there existed an atmosphere of coercion, an ignoring of the immigrant's own backgrounds and culture, and the assumption that American culture was something that was already complete. This viewpoint has been replaced by a more adequate understanding of the processes of assimilation and integration and to recognition of the value of the immigrant's contributions and assets.

Assimilation is no longer thought of as the abandoning by the new immigrant of everything the immigrant brings with and the imitation of what he finds, but as a process of creation for immigrant and American (Hall, 1935).

There are many different activities that are involved in work with immigrants. These fall under the following headings: personal service and social case work, education of the foreign born, group work, cooperation with agencies of the ethnic community, special programs for the second generation, fostering the folk arts, research and technical information services, education of the general public, and promotion of legislation and social action (Hall, 1935).

The reduction of immigration during the depression to the lowest point in more than 100 years has brought about a shift of emphasis regarding the types of work carried on in the field. In 1932 and subsequent years, departures have exceeded arrivals. The departing families and the government authorities desire to stimulate the departure and repatriation of immigrant individual welfare for social agencies to solve (Hall, 1935).

Furthermore, from the view of United States, unemployment and the stress of the depression have increased and intensified prejudice against the immigrant. This intolerance, reinforced by nationalism in the dominant society, has resulted in discrimination against the alien in important matters such as employment, work relief, and demands for stricter deportation laws. Citizenship has become more important since occupations open to immigrants have been limited by legislation. Social agencies have needed to meet increased demands for naturalization aid. Fortunately, Congress responded to their plans. In April, 1934 by cutting naturalization fees in half. Social workers have also advocated for equal treatment of citizens and immigrants in the matter

of work or home relief, urging that human need is crucial to citizenship and that once an immigrant has been admitted for permanent residence, the country cannot in decency discriminate against the immigrant (Hall, 1935).

Social Work, Immigrant Groups, and Internment Camps

In 1943, the United States census reported a total of 11,419,138 immigrants in the United States. This number showed a decrease of 18.3 percent from 1930 and constituted 8.7 percent of the total population. The census also reported that 63.5 percent of the immigrant group were naturalized American citizens (Kurtz, 1943).

The registration of aliens in the fall of 1940 under the Alien Registration Act of June 28, 1940 reported that there were 4,741,971 aliens among the immigrants. The registration of alien enemies in the United States in January and February, 1942, reported 1,101,936 alien enemies – natives or citizens of Germany, Italy, and Japan among the 4,741,971 aliens (Kurtz, 1943).

Over 80 percent of the 4,741,971 aliens resided in 14 states. New York had 25 percent. California had 11 percent. Pennsylvania and Massachusetts had seven percent. Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, Texas, Ohio, Connecticut, Washington, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Rhode Island each had from one to six percent. Samplings of the registration reported that over 85 percent of the immigrants registered resided in cities of 10,000 population or over and over 47 percent were in cities of 500,000 or more, clearly indicating the urban character of our alien population (Kurtz, 1943).

Nineteen of the 4,741,971 aliens registered in 1940 had entered the United States prior to July, 1906, the year of the basic Naturalization Act. After that, a certificate of arrival was required for naturalization purposes. Fifty-one percent arrived between 1906

and 1924, the year of the Quota Act, 17 percent between 1924 and 1935, 4.9 percent between 1935 and 1938, and 5.5 percent between 1938 and 1940. Of the total alien registrants, 124,971 were not eligible by race or age for citizenship while 2,091,000 or 45.3 percent of those eligible for citizenship had taken steps to achieve naturalization (Kurtz, 1943).

These figures, obtained from the first registration of aliens conducted in the United States reflect the history of immigration to this country and the increasingly restrictive character of the United States' immigration policy. The waves of immigration rose and receded in response to political and economic pressures in Europe, industrial and agricultural expansion in the United States, wars, depressions, and the stricter controls of recent years. From 1820 to 1854, the volume of immigration rose from 5,000 to over 400,000 annually. English, Scots, Dutch, Irish, Danes, Germans, Swedes, and Norwegians came in increasing numbers. They came fleeing religious persecutions in England, famine in Ireland, political revolution in Germany, and economic depressions in Europe to take up free land in the West, to work in the mines, and to build railroads, industries, and cities in the New World (Kurtz, 1943).

The waves of immigration decreased during the Civil War but returned again as the states, railroads, industries, and even the federal government actively stimulated immigration. After 1880 came Russians, Italians, Poles, Lithuanians, Slovaks, Greeks, Ukrainian, Hungarians, Bohemians, and Jews from southern and eastern Europe, who arrived at the rate of 1,000,000 a year prior to World War I, from 1914 to 1918 (Kurtz, 1943).

Immediately following the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt on December 8, 1941, issued proclamations identifying as alien enemies those natives and citizens of Germany (including Austria), Italy, and Japan resident in the United States and its territories who had not acquired American citizenship. The proclamations made such alien enemies subject to summary arrest on suspicion of subversive conduct and to internment for the duration of the war, and in effect deprived them of access to the civil courts with respect to internment. Regulations were prescribed as to their conduct. They were obliged to deposit at police stations all firearms, cameras, short-wave radio sets, and other designated articles. Travel by air was prohibited and travel beyond the confines of the community of residence required the permission of the local United States Attorney, whose consent was also necessary for changes of residence and employment. The proclamations also directed the Secretary of War to prescribe military or restricted areas from which alien enemies might be excluded at the direction of the military commanders of the areas (Kurtz, 1943).

Alien enemies under suspicion were arrested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on Presidential warrants and placed in the custody of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. In deference to the democratic process of trial by jury, the Attorney General established civilian hearing boards before which those arrested might appear and present explanations of their conduct or evidence of their loyalty. These boards were authorized to recommend to the Attorney General, as the final arbiter, internment, parole, or dismissal. Following receipt of orders for internment, alien enemies were placed in the custody of the Army for the duration of the war. By September 30, 1942, only 11,372 alien enemies had been taken into custody, a

comparatively small number considering the total of alien enemies in the country, and an indication of the loyalty of the great majority of the alien population to the United States (Kurtz, 1943).

Although all identified as alien enemies remained subject to summary arrest, the Attorney General exempted certain groups from the necessity of compliance with the regulations prescribed. This action was based on the presumption that the exempted groups presented no threats to the public safety and was taken to remove the stigma attached to the classification of alien enemy. Those exempted were Austrians and Austro-Hungarians who had registered as such in the alien registration of 1940; natives and former citizens of Germany, Italy, and Japan, who had acquired the citizenship of countries other than Germany, Italy, or Japan prior to December 8, 1941 (Kurtz, 1943).

In the interest of national unity, the development of the fullest contribution of alien enemy residents on a basis of equal participation in the war, the Department of Justice was urged to include other groups among the exempted classes, such as those who had entered the country before 1924 and were over sixty years of age. They also were urged to include petitioners for final citizenship whose applications had been examined, refugees from Germany who had been expatriated and declared to be enemies by decrees of the German Reich, and close relatives of members of the armed forces. It was also urged that civilian hearing boards be established to consider the exemption of individuals not included in the group exemptions (Kurtz, 1943).

That the Department of justice gave serious consideration to these proposals was suggested by the Presidential proclamation of July 17, 1942, with respect to the status of Hungarians, Rumanians, and Bulgarians after the United States had declared war on these

countries. This proclamation avoided the problems created by earlier proclamations concerning Germans, Italians, and Japanese. It declared all natives and nationals of these countries to be alien enemies of Hungary, Romania, or Bulgaria. In the judgment of the Attorney General or the Secretary of War, if these individuals were violating, or were about to violate any regulation adopted by the President, or any criminal law of the United States or of the States or Territories, they would be subject to summary arrest as an alien enemy. The proclamation otherwise failed to include the regulations concerning travel, radios, and changes of residence and employment. By these provisions only those Hungarians Rumanians, and Bulgarians actually arrested as suspicious persons became alien enemies and no regulations were prescribed with respect to others of these nationalities. This action was a clear recognition that racial origins and nationality do not provide local bases for the determination of friends and enemies in a war of political ideologies and that statesmanship recognizes the need of a discriminating government policy with respect to alien residents (Kurtz, 1943).

Under the residential proclamations of December 8, 1941, the Secretary of War and military commanders were authorized to designate military areas from which alien enemies might be excluded. This authority proved inadequate, however, to meet the situation which arose on the West Coast after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Fears of "fifth column" activities among the Japanese were rampant and widespread clamor arose in the press and among the public on the West Coast for the evacuation of all Japanese, aliens and citizens alike. The Army considered this to be a matter of military necessity (Kurtz, 1943).

As provision had not been made for the evacuation of American citizens, President Roosevelt issued an executive order in February, 1942, authorizing the removal of any and all persons from military areas prescribed by the Secretary of War or military commanders. The right of any person to enter, remain in, or leave such areas was made subject to whatever, restrictions the Secretary of War or the military commander might impose in his discretion. Under this order the commander of the Army's West Coast area in March, 1942, designated virtually the entire West Coast area of the states of California, Oregon, and Washington as Military Areas No. 1 and No. 2. These later became orders German, Italian, and Japanese aliens and any persons of Japanese ancestry were to be excluded. Orders ordering the evacuation of all persons of Japanese ancestry to designated assembly centers soon followed this proclamation. German and Italian aliens were placed under limited curfew restrictions in districts within the military areas and lived under the constant threat of evacuation orders, which it was assumed would be issued when the Japanese evacuation had been completed (Kurtz, 1943).

By June 1, 1942, the Army had moved approximately 100,000 Japanese from their homes to 18 assembly centers that had been prepared for them. The movement, unprecedented in American history, was carried out with speed and efficiency and without mishap. In the first days of the evacuation many of the Japanese sold their farms and possessions at sacrificed prices. However, the transfer of property was soon organized under the guidance of the Farm Security Administration and the Federal Reserve Bank and losses were not as great as might have been expected. The War Relocation Authority, a civilian organization, was established in the office for emergency Management by Presidential executive order to take over responsibility for the evacuees

form the Army at the assembly centers and to establish them in permanent resettlement centers. Sites were chosen in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Utah, and Wyoming, each center to accommodate from 10,000 to 15,000 persons. Smaller units might have more readily facilitated an early return to normal life for the evacuees in integrated communities, but practical considerations of control and expediency served to postpone to a later day any answer to the disturbing question of what is to become of the Japanese eventually. The Japanese conducted themselves with excellent discipline in complying with the orders of evacuation and in cooperating in the task of organizing the new life in the assembly centers, in spite of underlying cynicism and resentment because of their changed status (Kurtz, 1943).

Although there was general disposition not to question the military judgment of the necessity of these drastic procedures, it was recognized that they raised serious fundamental questions concerning the rights of American citizens among the Japanese. In defense of the action it was claimed that racial and cultural characteristics of the Japanese made it impractical to attempt to determine the loyal and disloyal among them. The older alien Japanese presented lesser threats of subversive action than the American born, prone to resent the discriminations that they suffered from their fellow American citizens. Evacuation of Japanese aliens alone would result in the separation of families and create dependency and that military reverses in the Pacific theater of war might easily produce mob violence against the innocent and guilty alike. Consequently evacuation was necessary for the protection of the Japanese themselves (Kurtz, 1943).

The evacuation on the West Coast carried with it serious implications for German and Italian alien enemies. This occurred not only on the West Coast but also throughout

the country, particularly on the East Coast where the majority of German refugees were concentrated, and where Italian immigrants of earlier years (numbering some 650,000) who, for various reasons had failed to become citizens, were widely distributed. The German refugees suffered from mixed emotions. Persecuted and driven from their homeland, deprived of their property and positions, separated from families and associates, they had finally reached a haven where they could breathe freely without fear of Gestapo surveillance. For this hospitality they were sincerely grateful. But having suffered and fought their Nazi oppressors they were at a loss to understand their status as alien enemies, particularly in the light of the fact that they had been expatriated and declared to enemies by decrees of the German Reich. Seemingly this designation and the threats of evacuation from homes and positions so recently acquired after months of heartbreaking adjustment were but a recurrence of the very pressures from which they had so recently escaped. They found it difficult to understand or to accept suggestions that their European experiences would not necessarily be repeated in America. To them the first steps of registration and evacuation seemed inevitably to lead to concentration in internment camps (Kurtz, 1943).

Fortunately, however, the threat of mass evacuation of Italians and Germans from the east coast was finally dissipated by announcements by the commander of the Army's east coast area that mass evacuations were not contemplated and that only individuals whose presence in certain areas was considered dangerous would be removed. Assurance on this point was increased by similar announcements by the Secretary of War. Also, the command of the Army's West Coast area later announced that mass evacuation orders for German and Italian aliens would not be issued (Kurtz, 1943).

On October 12, 1942, the Attorney General exempted all aliens of Italian nationality from the necessity of complying with regulations governing the conduct of alien enemies. Later, this group was also exempted from the curfew regulations in effect in the West Coast military areas (Kurtz, 1943).

There was discrimination in employment. Hospitality and tolerance extended to aliens and minority groups during times of peace and prosperity change rapidly to feelings of fear and hostility in periods of depression and war. In the United States this phenomenon has found frequent expression in discrimination in employment. During the depression years of the decade 1930-1940, citizenship became increasingly a qualification for employment. Private employers were influenced by federal legislation excluding aliens from Work Projects Administration work and other forms of federal employment, and by the growing amount of state legislation excluding aliens from certain occupations. This trend became so intensified as the United States became involved in the current war that it even handicapped the war production effort. The President, the Attorney General, the Secretaries of War and the Navy, the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, and the Minority Groups Service of the War Manpower Commissions, as well as the Committee on Discrimination in Employment of the State War Council of New York, frequently advised the public that aliens, including alien enemies, might be employed not only in normal industry but under all regular contracts issued by the Army and Navy. Certain laws prevent the employment of aliens on "Classified" contracts involving secret, confidential, or restricted tasks and on aircraft work, unless individual permits have been issued by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy (Kurtz, 1943).

No statistical data are available on the extent of discrimination in practice. Citizens unable to produce proof of citizenship, citizens with foreign-sounding names, Jews, and Negroes have suffered along with aliens and alien enemies. For some months after December 7, 1941, German refugees experienced difficulty in maintaining employment and in securing new positions but their situation improved later as the demand for workers increased. There is no substantial evidence that their lot was worse than the other groups affected (Kurtz, 1943).

Further Reporting on the Internment Camps

Wartime restriction and difficulties of travel have extensively decreased the value of immigration and emigration in recent years. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, the last prewar year, approximately 83,000 immigrants were admitted to the United States. The volume of immigration decreased steadily after that, falling below 71,000 in 1940, 52,000 in 1941, 29,000 in 1942, and reaching the low point of 23,725 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944 (Kurtz, 1945).

The path of immigration has paralleled that of emigration, decreasing each year since the beginning of the war. In the fiscal year 1939, a total of 26,651 aliens emigrated from the United States. The number of emigrant aliens fell to 5,107 in 1943 and to approximately 5,400 in 1944. This decrease may be attributable in part to wartime controls of alien departures, where a permit must be obtained by any alien leaving the country. Other factors include the wartime hazards of travel, the high level of employment in the United States, and the limited volume of recent immigration (Kurtz, 1945).

Over the ten-year period following the advent of the Nazi party in Germany in 1933, the United States received a total of 507,159 natives of the 18 European countries that eventually came under Axis domination. Almost one-half, 228,068, of those admitted came only for temporary stay. The remaining 279,071 who were admitted for permanent residence presumably included what refugees reached the United States, but it cannot be assumed that all of these permanent admissions were refugees (Kurtz, 1945).

With the beginning of war, all nationals of Germany, Italy, and Japan were declared enemy aliens, were refused to register and to obtain certificates of identity, and became subject to certain restrictions on their activities and conditions of travel. Nationals of Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria were classified as enemy aliens a few months later. Immigrants of enemy nationality who were considered potentially dangerous were apprehended under enemy proceedings and delivered to the Immigration and Naturalization Service at or near the place of apprehension. After the hearings, if the apprehended immigrants were ordered released or paroled, such action was taken immediately, but if ordered interned they were delivered over to Army-authorities for internment (Kurtz, 1945).

In early 1943, arrangements were made for the transfer of all civilian interns to the custody of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and a total of 4,120 were transferred. As of June 30, 1943, the number of civilian internees was 9,220, distributed among 16 internment camps, including two camps for certain families of internal immigrants who have accepted voluntary internment in order to be together (Kurtz, 1945).

The number of civilian internees was reduced by repatriations. Other internees were released on parole, when the results of investigation were satisfactory and when a citizen sponsor could be secured. By June 30, 1944, the number of enemy aliens in internment was reduced to about 6,174. Arrangements were made whereby those considered less dangerous and willing to work were given employment outside the camps. A large number of immigrants were employed in agriculture, in construction, in railroad maintenance, and in other types of work (Kurtz, 1945).

War prisoners' aid representatives of the National Council of the Young Men's Christian Associations, the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations, and the National Catholic Welfare Conference visited the camps regularly and provided internees with recreational, handicraft, and educational supplies. The American Friends Service Committee established a program of cultural events for the various camps. Financial aid and social services to families of internees outside the camps, and to internees who were paroled, were provided by a cooperative program operated by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the associates of the Social Security Board. This program was financed by federal funds. In many situations, private agencies augmented the program with their services and resources. Recognizing the importance of social service work among internees, the Immigration and Naturalization Service trained social workers on its staff to deal with problems that arose in family camps (Kurtz, 1945).

Reporting and Reflection on the Internment Camps

A significant phenomenon recorded in this year was the steady decline in the number of persons of foreign births in the population. To a certain degree, this decrease

in the number of immigrants was due to temporary conditions engendered by World War II and the worldwide depression that preceded that conflict. To a larger degree, however, this represents a long-range trend that resulted from the policy of restricted immigration stemming from the quota laws of 1921 and 1924 (Kurtz, 1947).

During the war, immigrants of enemy nationality became subject to many restrictions and regulations limiting their activities. Soon after the Pearl Harbor attack, all nationals of Germany, Italy, and Japan were declared enemy aliens, were restricted in traveling and in the possession of certain articles such as cameras, firearms, radio, and so forth, and were required to register and obtain certificates of identity. Nationals of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania were classified as enemy aliens a few months later (Kurtz, 1947).

The United States, unlike other less friendly nations, never resorted to mass internment of aliens from enemy countries. Immigrants of certain nationalities that were thought of as potentially dangerous were subject to internment for the rest of the war. This internment was ordered, however, only after hearings by specially consulted boards and review of each case by the Attorney General. Those that were given orders for internment were housed in internment camps operated by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. As of June 30, 1943, at the height of the internal program, the number of civilian internees totaled only 9,220, distributed among 16 detention camps. The figure should be compared with the total of more than one million aliens of enemy nationality, in the United States at the outbreak of hostilities. After the war terminated, the internment program was eliminated as rapidly as possible (Kurtz, 1947).

Another wartime program of entirely different complexion was the importation of foreign labor from Western Hemisphere countries. Entry was allowed under agreements with the Mexican government in August 1942, and with the governments of the Bahamas and Jamaica in March and April, 1943, which contained guarantees of wage rates, living conditions and eventual repatriation (Kurtz, 1947).

Among the earliest voluntary social agencies in the United States were those for the benefit of immigrants. There is increasing recognition in professional social work that immigrants often have problems different in form, focus, and intensity from those of the native population. Emotionally, the immigrants, especially the refugee and displaced person, have needs that are little understood by Americans (Hodges, 1951).

At the end of World War II, about 8,000,000 displaced persons had been forced into Germany, Austria, and Italy from other countries of Europe. By the end of 1946, approximately 7,000,000 had returned to their countries of nationality, birth, or former residence. The United States government early recognized the importance of resettling the remaining (about one million) persons whose unwanted presence in Germany, Austria, and Italy slowed their economic recovery and kept as potential source of unrest in Central Europe (Hodges, 1951).

Chapter 4. Analysis and Results of Historical Study

Social work was concerned with many social and political ramifications in the United States before, during, and after World War II. In 1933, social work was concerned with the process of immigration, specifically the emotional and financial chasm between immigrants and the dominant society. There were legal and social ramifications that affected immigrants of this period, and social work observed the immigrant population as a whole. Specific ethnic groups were not mentioned individually, but rather immigrants were described as having the same experiences and needs.

In 1935, more tension was mentioned about the dominant society and immigrant groups. Mention was also made of tension between older immigrants and their children who were reflecting their own cultural. Still, many of the same problems existed regarding the stress of adjustment of immigrants in their new country. Problems of intolerance and discrimination were also briefly mentioned. The work that social workers engaged in with immigrants included education, cultural awareness, promotion of legislation and social action, casework, and group work.

In 1941, social workers discussed the vulnerability of immigrants and how they could easily be exploited upon arrival to this country. The processes and events that an immigrant goes through upon arrival in the United States were discussed with empathy given toward the immigrant's plight.

In 1943, social workers documented different groups of immigrants, their numbers, and where they migrated to in the United States (Kurtz, 1943). It was in this year that social workers discussed in their national conference documented in the Social

Work Year Book the events that occurred in 1941 with Pearl Harbor and the internment camps. Extensive mention was made of the Germans, Italians, and Japanese immigrants who were labeled as alien enemies. Even alien enemies of Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria were made note of by the social work profession during this year. The Japanese were given harsher conditions than were the Germans and Italians and note of their conditions was made also. There was a condescending tone toward the Japanese at one point in the Year Book for 1943, but other than this, events seemed to be reported objectively. Social workers noted that Germans had mixed emotions about their internment since many had fled Nazi Germany. They were at a loss as to why they were then labeled alien enemies in the United States.

In 1945, again the plight of Germans, Italians, Japanese, Hungarians, Romanians, and Bulgarians was made note of as a significant event during this year. What was written in this year was in reference to 1943 (Kurtz, 1943). The United States placed people in internment camps on a case by case basis. Social workers stated that people were not interned en masse, but this was not true. The Japanese were interned en masse.

In 1951, the Social Work Year Book was still discussing what had taken place with the immigrants who were placed in internment camps after World War II. During this year, mention was made of their needs and the lack of understanding on the part of Americans toward the displaced persons.

Throughout the Social Work Year Books regarding immigrants after World War II, the social work profession seemed aware of and concerned about the well-being of the refugees. It seems evident that the social work profession was bound to comply with directions toward placement in internment camps. Indeed, at one point, the social work

profession held a condescending tone toward the people who were interned noting that they were following orders as well as they could and were complying with the rules. The social work profession did not speak out against the treatment of the internees, although they were aware of their plight. With the hysteria and paranoia directed toward alien enemies directly after World War II, social workers themselves were affected and influenced by this propaganda. After the war, the social work profession had more time to reflect on what had taken place in the internment camps. They seemed to hold disbelief and denial about the extent of the psychological damage done to the internees.

This study analyzed historically the profession of social work's involvement in immigration policies and social welfare programs. This study sought to explore how the social work profession related to immigration policy from the turn of the century until the present, focusing on the aftermath of World War II. From analyzing the data, it was found that the social work profession developed over the course of World War II and used different methods in its response. At the beginning, the social work profession did not distinguish so much between the various immigrant groups. The social work profession was less involved in immigrant concerns during this time period. Afterward, there was a period of reflection in which the social work profession assessed the plight of individual immigrant groups and how the internment camps impacted them.

It was made mention that Germans and Japanese had difficulty finding and retaining employment after the war. But it was also noted that blacks, Jews, and other groups had difficulty in this realm and other areas. The level of racial tension appears heightened during this time and many groups appear to have been targeted. The targeting

of racial acts toward different groups might already have been present in this society, and were exacerbated by the events of World War II.

The analysis and findings showed that social work viewed immigration as a whole before World War II and differentiated the immigrant groups more specifically after World War II. Part of this differentiation in the aftermath of World War II was due to the fact that the social work profession had time to report and reflect on the impact of internment camps on foreigners. During the war, there was much going on and it was difficult to maintain an objective perspective on the treatment of immigrant groups. Immigrant policy and the social work perspective on immigration were in flux, developing and changing. Not until after the war did social workers objectively report with an emphasis on the needs of the immigrants and minority groups in the United States. This could be attributed to the fact that social workers were caught up in the hysteria of the war and the paranoia and fear regarding alien enemies.

The social work profession was involved in aspects that related to immigration but not directly. They were involved in an auxiliary sense. For instance, the social work profession dealt with issues of education, child welfare, and health care. After the war, social work became more concerned with the direct situations of immigrants and the effects of society on them. Currently, social work focuses on immigrant groups but not as a whole. There are certain aspects of social work that deal directly with immigrant groups, but it is not planned out. Social work still addresses problems as or after they arise as they did during the time of World War II. It is as if the immigrant groups are invisible until there are seemingly insurmountable problems that arise. Then social work will step in and try to alleviate the undesirable situations for various immigrant groups

that need the help. Social work does try and help the immigrant groups become better adapted to the American culture and is one of the few liaisons that new immigrant groups have when they arrive to the United States. However, there are gaps in this also. For instance, parents do not always have the necessary parenting skills to help their children adapt to this culture. They may use parenting skills that we consider abusive and then face authorities on criminal charges. There are more improvements to be made in working with immigrant groups even today.

Chapter 5. Discussion

Due to the struggle for professional recognition of the social work profession, social workers did not speak out against the injustice done to the people who were sent to the concentration camps in the United States. They maintained silence about this injustice. Their loyalty was to the United States government and their own advancement as a profession. In fact, there were Japanese dissidents who spoke out against the unjust treatment of the government toward them. In certain protests in the internment camps, deaths occurred because of outspoken Japanese dissidents. Although social work may have added certain dimensions of professionalism by maintaining silence, how did this silence benefit the profession? Would social work have benefited more by speaking out against the injustice in the United States during World War II? Could social workers have laid groundwork for future mistreatment of oppressed people? Had social workers taken a stance then as Jane Addams did during World War I, what would have happened? Perhaps some social workers might have been jailed or ostracized. What would this have meant for the profession? There might have been some history in our past of speaking out. At a time when many injustices were occurring, the window of opportunity was present for anyone to question the mistreatment of a group. This opportunity passed by with minimal resistance or questioning by the social workers. Perhaps social work would have lost favor in the eyes of the public for awhile, but what would this action have meant today? Even though Jane Addams lost favor and power after speaking out in World War I against the war, she is still remembered for her Settlement House work and her work with immigrants. Even though Martin Luther King was assassinated, he is remembered for his civil rights efforts. Are not these efforts worth speaking out against?

Is this a call of social work, to speak out against injustice, even though the majority of the population may profess their loyalty to the status quo of their lives or to racial hatred? If more social workers had protested, what would this have meant for the profession then? What would it mean now or fifty years from now? What will happen when the next outbreak of concentration camps occurs? What are we doing about injustices that are occurring today? How important is our profession to us and how do we want to define it? What kind of recognition do we want to seek and from whom? If we maintain silence, others will speak for us, or the absence of our voices will remain in the history books as they did during World War II in the Social Work Year Books. Why weren't social workers more horrified? Part of the answer is due to the hysteria and paranoia and commitment to industry during World War II. And part of the answer lies in the desire for recognition as a serious profession. But at what cost and to whom? Some of the most outspoken people in history have been outside of the profession of social work. Cannot the social work profession gather enough voices to speak out against the treatment of children, minorities, immigrants, criminals, and other disenfranchised groups? In some ways we are succeeding, but in some ways we are not. Specht and Courtney have also raised the question of the commitment of social workers to the oppressed (Specht and Courtney, 1994). How much has our past silence affected our present profession? And how will our present silence affect our future profession? As the opportunities were present during World War II, the choices and opportunities are in front of us today. There are many answers to these questions. The choices are ours.

References

- Bach, R. (1993). Changing Relations: Newcomers and Established Residents in U.S. Communities. New York: Ford Foundation.
- Bailyn, B., Dallek, R., Davis, D.B., Donald, D.H., Thomas, J.L., Wood, G.S. (1985). The Great Republic: A History of the American People, Third Edition. Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company: Lexington, Massachusetts.
- Bean, F.D., Vernez, G., Keely, C.B. (1989). Opening and Closing the Doors: Evaluating Immigration Reform and Control. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Booth, A., Crouter, A.C., Landale, N. (1997). Immigration and the Family: Research and Policy on U.S. Immigrants. New jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Bromwell, W.J. (1969). History of Immigration to the United States. New York: Arno Press and The New York Times.
- Burner, D., Fox-Genovese, E., Genovese, E.D., McDonald, F. (1985). An American Portrait: A History of the United States, Second Edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Chinese Exclusion Act of 1881, 22 Stat. 58.
- Displaced Persons Act of 1948, 62 Stat. 1009.
- Dublin T. (1993). Immigrant Voices: New Lives in America, 1773-1986. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Fix, M. and Passel, J.S. (1994). Immigration and Immigrants: Setting the Record Straight. Washington D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Hall, F. S. (Ed.) (1943). Social Work Year Book: A Description of Organized Activities in Social Work and in Related Fields. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Immigration Act of 1917, 39 Stat. 874.
- Immigration Act of 1924, 43 Stat. 153.
- Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (McCarran Walter Act: 66 Stat. 163).
- Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965, Pub. L. 96-212.

Kurtz, R.H. (Ed.) (1943). Social Work Year Book: A Description of Organized Activities in Social Work and in Related Fields. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Leedy, P.D. (1993). The Historical Study. Practical Research Planning and Design (fifth edition) MacMillan Publishing Co.

Nadel, S. (1990). Little Germany: Ethnicity, Religion, and Class in New York City, 1845-80. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Specht, H. and Courtney, M.E. (1994). Unfaithful Angels: How Social Work has Abandoned its Mission. New York: The Free Press.

Stevens M.A. (Ed.). (1993). Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (10th ed.). Massachusetts: Merriam-Webster, Incorporated.

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service [U.S. INS], 1983.

Tischauser, L.V. (1990). The Burden of Ethnicity: The German Question in Chicago, 1914-1941. New York & London: Garland Publishing.

The World Almanac and Book of Facts 1999. New Jersey: World Almanac Books: A Primedia Company.

War Brides Act of 1954 and 1947, 59 Stat. 659, 61 Stat. 401.